

KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Clarion Hotel, Millbrae, CA
March 8-11, 1998

March 8, 1998, 2:00 pm

McIsaac: I convene the 52nd meeting of the KFMC. Will the members please introduce themselves.

Members present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Pliny McCovey	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish & Game
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fishery Management Council

Other speakers:

George Kautsky	Technical Advisory Team (TAT), Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Michael Mohr	TAT, California Dept. of Fish and Game
Don Koblick	Princeton Harbor
Duncan MacLean	Salmon Advisory Sub-Panel (SAS) California Troll representative
Gerald Reinholdt	SAS Oregon representative
Hal Cribbs	Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force
Jim Welter	SAS, Oregon Recreational Fisher

McIsaac: The first item on the agenda is to review and approve the agenda. Are there any changes requested?

Agendum 1. Review and approve minutes.

Bitts: I would like a Technical Advisory Team (TAT) report of 1997 harvest results, especially the late fall catch.

McIsaac: Let's put that before item #9.

Fletcher: I would like to see spring chinook information from 1997, and any progress on their assignment.

McIsaac: Let's also put that before item #9.

Iverson: I would like #9 expanded to include the California Fish and Game Commission (CFGC) proceedings.

McIsaac: Let's put that before the technical portion of #9.

Iverson: I would also like to see an item on funding for monitoring.

McIsaac: Let's put that before the recess today if we have time to look at it.

Wilkinson: We're in the same position as last year. We are coming to the Task Force (TF) with monitoring requests at their June budget time.

Bostwick: Rod said he would have data on the proposed listing of steelhead.

McInnis: I don't think I can get it today. It won't affect the 1998 season.

McIsaac: Let's put that last today. I want to move item #4 to just before the recess.

Motion to approve agenda.

Motion passes unanimously

Agendum 2. Review handouts.

(See Appendix 1)

Agendum 3. Approve the minutes of the October 1997 meeting.

Wilkinson: I move to approve the minutes from the October 1997 meeting as amended. (Handout B)

Motion passes unanimously

Agendum 5. Letter to the Secretary of Interior re: the Environmental Assessment (EA) of Klamath River flows.

Fletcher: I just drafted this a letter (Handout E). I wanted to make sure the motion was reflected accurately in that letter.

McIsaac: Let's move for final approval later this week after we have time to review it.

Agendum 6. Letter to the California Dept. of Fish and Game (CDFG) regarding monitoring.

Bingham: I am still working on this letter. Please move this to the next session.

Agendum 7. Information update on steelhead recovery plan and funding.

Boydston: We have available a copy of the plan for steelhead monitoring and recovery written by the CDFG and given to the Southwest Region of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The impetus was the NMFS proposal to list the Klamath Province Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of steelhead trout as threatened in December of 1997. The CDFG met with NMFS and the State of Oregon to discuss a strategy for developing a conservation plan to avert listing. I would like to show an overhead (Handout F) outlining that plan. The areas involved are the Rogue, Chetco, Winchuck, Smith, and Klamath-Trinity Rivers. The plan we developed has 6 goals.

- 1) Fishing regulations: approved on an emergency basis, a 0 bag limit on adult steelhead with the exceptions shown in Handout F. To protect juveniles, small tributaries are closed, and there are gear

restrictions in medium and large rivers;

2) Hatcheries: all hatchery steelhead will be marked;

3) Monitoring: we have submitted a budget change proposal within CDFG for \$1.4 million annually to do the list of items in Handout F, surveys, adult sampling, weir counts;

4) Oversight: we've proposed to create a KMP management group made up of entities listed in Handout F;

5) Laws: enforcement activities and public meetings to inform public;

6) Habitat: review of State and federal habitat protection programs.

The Governor's watershed protection program includes legislation that will put \$43 million over 6 years to watershed recovery plans. We are completing a Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA) with NMFS that includes a review of our Forest Practices Act. The completion of this review is set for January 1, 1999. The completion of regulations by the Commission, and monitoring plans are ongoing. The critical date is March 13, when NMFS will announce its opinion on the California and Oregon steelhead plans.

Bostwick: Why was seining below the Highway 101 Bridge cut? Was it a lack of funds?

Boydstun: Yes, there is a scarcity of stock information, especially winter and fall run populations, so we are reinstating that.

Fletcher: I'm concerned with the lack of tribal involvement. The tribes harvest steelhead, and there are a number of tribal projects that would dovetail well with the State. If we're not in on it, that causes me heartburn. The state must recognize the tribes' role in resource management and efforts to get more water in the system. We are a co-management group. We are interested in being involved.

Boydstun: See the bottom of page 11 of the plan (Handout G). Goal 14 references working with the tribes. We hate to create more management groups. We hope to coordinate the activities of the KFMC with this new group.

McIsaac: Is some of the \$1.4 million the State is kicking in going to the Trinity weir?

Boydstun: No. If it fails to get funded, it will seriously impact steelhead.

Wilkinson: Is that the same for the Shasta weir? You have extended it occasionally for steelhead.

Boydstun: No, Shasta counts will continue.

Wilkinson: This should help the issue with the Shasta Coordinated Resource Management Planning Group (CRMP).

Fletcher: The steelhead report calls for law enforcement. Will this extend beyond forest practices, to agricultural impacts? In the previous steelhead report, Dennis McEwan identified the need for the State Fish and Game code to be enforced. There is a case CDFG was developing on Yreka Creek. There should be civil penalties. Will CDFG pursue it?

Boydstun: I don't know. I will check.

Fletcher: Over the summer in the tributaries, lack of flow is limiting. We hope that law enforcement will be put into the plan to prosecute unwise water management activities.

Bingham: At least CDFG is back up again to previous levels regarding personnel and dollars. This is a complete plan for regulating fisheries, but it says "Forest practices rules will be reviewed." That won't be an easy process. The timber industry says the rules are adequate to protect steelhead. That is not the case. We advance the principal of regulatory parity. Many tributaries are over drafted. Agriculture also needs to be looked at. Rivers like the Navarro, where vineyards have come in, used to be good steelhead habitat and are now dry in the summer.

Iverson: LB, the Klamath Task Force (TF) members worry that the TF is not mentioned in the steelhead plan. Is there a disconnect here?

Boydston: Many ongoing things are not mentioned here. We are trying to focus on new initiatives.

McIsaac: Is there any protection for tribal fisheries that the tribes might see?

Fletcher: There is a secretarial order from the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the Department of Commerce (DOC) regarding tribes and endangered species. We read this to mean the government has to address habitat problems, and insure adequate flows from the Trinity project. It means addressing problems on the Shasta and Scott Rivers and applying restrictions to tribes as a last resort. We plan to hold the secretaries of Interior and Commerce responsible.

McCovey: The Hoopa Tribe is looking at revising our logging practices. We lost \$50 million in revenue due to instituting riparian buffers. This problem is big.

Fletcher: The secretaries aren't doing their jobs. A zero fishery won't bring back the fish if the habitat problems continue.

McIsaac: Rod, do you have a response regarding conservation plans and steelhead?

McInnis: Our actions will be available next week. The court ordered us to make a final decision by March 13. There are 3 potential listings of steelhead ESU's in California, 5 in all. The choices are to list the ESU's as threatened, endangered, or not list. We already extended this decision 6 months and then 1 month more. If an ESU is not listed, then a candidate listing could occur. That would mean no regulation, but it puts it on a high priority list for the future.

McIsaac: Further questions? Thank you Rod.

Agendum 8. Letter to the CDFG regarding hatchery marking.

McIsaac: Pliny, is Mike here?

McCovey: George, can you address this?

Kautsky: I didn't have time to review this letter (Handout H). We had a presentation last month from Dr.

Hankin who was concerned that the total enumeration of the fish released from the Trinity River hatchery may not be accurate, and marking was not representative of the entire release group. Dr. Hankin proposed a methodology that required handling of all the fish to remedy this, some 3 million chinook fingerlings. LB was going to make a phone call and pursue it. If that didn't work, Mike would write a letter.

McIsaac: Is that the same letter as in this handout ?

Fletcher: A draft letter came out in March 1997, and we said we couldn't support selective fisheries, as mentioned in that draft. This March 1998 letter is a revision of that, with selective fisheries taken out.

Bitts: We have two distinct issues here. Mass marking for selective fisheries is what is covered here in this letter we have before us. Last month we were talking about constant fractional marking of chinook.

McIsaac: Let's put this with agenda #5 and #6. George will you write a new draft?

Kautsky: On the Trinity, the fish are all are being marked with fin clips. I don't know about Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH).

Fletcher: Let's wrap these two issues together.

Kautsky: I don't know if the Commission is the right audience for this letter.

Boydston: The issue here is that the tribes and others would like to see representative marking of chinook at both hatcheries. It's happening at Trinity River hatchery. I spoke to Dr. Hankin, and the hatchery has his report. We don't want to handle every fish. So we are going to have a meeting. This letter is premature.

McIsaac: We have no motions relative to this from Eureka. The motion on this letter was left from 1997. Our main chore is the 1998 management season. Let's look at what we have in front of us. Dave Bitts has brought up a question on 1997 harvest. We have spring chinook mentioned by Troy. We have a report on the CFGC from LB. We have the KOHM and other technical questions from our TAT.

BREAK

McIsaac: Let's continue. Dave Bitts you had a question for the TAT.

Inserted agenda. 1997 fall tag recoveries.

Bitts: My question had to do with late fall fish, the numbers and locations of tag recoveries, and 1997 harvest numbers.

Kautsky: Michael Mohr will present a report that will address that. Last year we had late fall tags because fish in the '92 brood year had been tagged in those lower tributaries. Subsequent brood years in those creeks were not tagged, so we have no late fall data this year.

McIsaac: Troy, you had a question regarding spring chinook.

Fletcher: I just want to keep the issue alive. I want a routine report on spring chinook, on what the TAT has been doing.

Kautsky: I last reported to you in October. We've finished the scale analysis for the hatchery fish. We are still attempting to put the naturals into an age composition. We are now mounting the scales for analysis. We should be done by late April. I promised you a list of management alternatives and data needs. I should have that by April.

Inserted Agendum. Report on the decision from the CFGC regarding inriver allocation.

McIsaac: Rod, Hal Cribbs and I were at the CFGC meeting in San Diego. The decision was the first item on the agenda of Friday morning. Robert Treanor noted that there were 4 letters on the subject opposed to changing the allocation. I testified representing the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) and asked that the status quo be maintained. Inriver fishermen asked for a larger allocation and to have it split into three components. Zeke Grader testified and asked for no change. Hal Cribbs testified and asked for 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. Mr. Treanor handed out diagrams and the March 2nd letter we have here today (Handout D). There were questions regarding this year's quota compared to last year and the length of season. Commissioner McGeoghan made a comment that the PFMC should be taking pressure off weak stocks in the ocean. He made a point that there isn't the information to support a 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 and suggested a range of 15-20%. He mentioned the "zero sum nature of the problem and the invisibility of the issue". There was a 3-0 voice vote to approve a 15-20% range.

Cribbs: The Commission recognizes the adverse effect on winter run in the ocean, and noted that the gap in projected versus actual run size may effect weak stocks.

McIsaac: We expected a number, not a range, from the CFGC, but we speculated that it gave the PFMC some flexibility in meeting other constraints.

Wilkinson: You said a person discussed some division of the inriver allocation. Can you clarify that?

McIsaac: That was in regards to the inriver allocation, that 1/3 go to the estuary, 1/3 to the Trinity river, and 1/3 to the Klamath above Coon Creek.

Bostwick: No, he meant that one area be from the river mouth to 101 bridge, one from 101 bridge to the glen, and then the balance of the system, because that's how the fish are counted. It's already split 50/50 at Coon Creek. This is a split of the lower river.

McIsaac: He did also request more fish for in river.

Bitts: Was there any discussion of habitat restoration?

McIsaac: Zeke Grader did have comments.

McInnis: During the CFGC February meeting, it was discussed that the pie needed to be expanded and restoration was the way to increase the number of fish. I did offer Ron and his staff to make a presentation on TF accomplishments.

Fletcher: Maybe we can make suggestions to them. They are in a unique position to bring things to the attention of the Governor.

Bingham: We did invite the Commission Chair to join the 6 Chairs for that purpose.

Agendum 9. Additional harvest rate model (HRM) results, in light of the CFGC inriver allocation decision.

Kautsky: We ran the current stock size prediction through the HRM. The first run, (Handout I) is dated 14:29, 8th of March. This run used 15% of the non-tribal share to inriver. The result is 10,112 ocean harvest of Klamath fish, 1,784 to inriver recreation, 11,896 to tribal.

Boydston: We gave a different number to the Commission. Why?

Kautsky: That was based on the projected stock size ocean abundance, age 3 and 4. We based that number presented to the Commission on wrong preseason forecast numbers: 34,000 4's instead of 36,800. It was a faux pas. The second run, (Handout J) is dated March 8, 14:39, and it used 20%. The inriver increased to 2,352 and tribal decreases to 11,759 on account of the age structure, and where the impacts occur. The ocean harvest is 9,407.

Agendum 10. Review of the KOHM.

Mohr: We have a handout (Handout K) on the bias correction for the 1998 KOHM. This has just been finished. To answer LB's question, we can incorporate size limits in the KOHM for this year. Two other questions have been raised: will the effort adjustment be used in the Coos Bay cell (CSB) this year, and can we extend the base period to the present? This report addresses those, along with an assessment of the 1.63 factor in the SOC cell. The major findings have been discussed with the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), and will be discussed by the Salmon Technical Team (STT) tomorrow. [Reads Handout K]. The second handout (Handout L) shows plots of observed vs. predicted harvest rates by area, by age, and by month. The first page shows all areas combined; the subsequent pages show one cell on each page. The rows on each page show: Row 1, age 3's; Row 2, age 4's; Row 3, age 3's and 4's graphed together on the same plot; Row 4, ages 3 and 4 combined, (the overall harvest rate). Each plot shows the observed harvest rates in percent on the Y axis, and the predicted harvest rate in percent on the X axis. The scales on the axes are identical. The 45 degree dotted line shown represents a perfect prediction. The numbers on the plot represent the year in the 1990's of the data point (i.e., 4=1994). The solid line indicates the ratio estimator fit to the 1991 through 1997 data. The slope of the line = the average observed harvest rate/the average predicted harvest rate. The value of that slope is given in the plot sub-title, as an R value.

The KOHM overall has done well at conservatively predicting ocean harvest rates in the 1990's. On average, the observed has been 80% to 90% of predicted. The month-specific plots show considerable scatter. May and June rates have in general been over-predicted, while July and August have shown no clear pattern.

McIsaac: In the far right column, if testing for bias, if the points fall on the line, there is no bias?

Mohr: No bias and no variance.

McIsaac: When all the numbers are all below the line, then the bias is toward a lower observed harvest rate

than predicted?

Mohr: Yes.

McIsaac: So when people say the KOHM is biased by the old base period data, and it calls for a much higher harvest rate than actually has been realized in the 90's, that column would support that.

Mohr: Yes, but not by very much.

McInnis: Did you use the actual predicted values used in these years?

Mohr: Predicted values are the ones actually used.

Fletcher: Does this include the KMZ sport and the KMZ troll?

Mohr: Yes. We worked north to south. The slopes in the right column (the seasonal ratio estimators) seem to indicate that, excluding 1995, the Northern Oregon (NOR) cell has no big tendency toward bias. No change is recommended there for 1998.

McInnis: You don't address anything after August?

Mohr: Correct. Fall cells are not modeled in the KOHM. They are not predicted. Moving on, graphs of the CSB cell indicate a systematic over-prediction of harvest rates in the 1990's on the order of 15%. In 1997, the STT applied a correction factor to the CSB, recognizing that effort is about 10% of what it was in the base period. We recommend that the 10% adjustment factor be kept in 1998.

McInnis: The "R" value over each plot: is that a correlation factor?

Mohr: No, that is the slope of the solid line.

McInnis: How is the 10% adjustment applied?

Mohr: You take what the KOHM gives out and then take 10% of that.

Boydston: Would you try to weight it by relative abundance of fish in a given month?

Mohr: In the CSB, it's pretty consistent across months.

Bitts: When you did season ratios, that's not simply an addition of the monthly ratios, is it?

Mohr: It's the total landings for season over the May 1 abundance. It's a true seasonal harvest rate. In the Fort Bragg (FTB) cell, there is scatter, but is it unbiased. No correction is recommended. For the Southern California Cell (SOC), I have described my interpretation of the data and the reasoning behind our recommendation in Handout L. Looking at the SOC season graphs, the KOHM has under-predicted harvest rates by about 23% over the '90-'97 period. However, as explained in Handout L, this can be attributed

largely to a few outlying data points. We recommend using no bias correction factors to the SOC.

Fletcher: I need to absorb some of this. Last year I thought over-prediction in the CSB cell was balanced by under-prediction in the SOC.

Mohr: If you look at the season you might conclude that the KOHM under-predicted the SOC, but if you examine it by month and age class, you can see that isn't happening by and large.

Fletcher: The KMZ sport impacts have been over-predicted for 17 years. That's a safety factor. What will happen to that safety buffer with this recommendation?

Mohr: I didn't analyze the KMZ data.

McIsaac: Why not?

Mohr: There is too much going on.

Bitts: You are recommending that the exploitation rate inflation factors (see Handout K) be set at the same levels used in 1996 and 1997?

Mohr: Yes. Those have been used in the 90's and have been incorporated into the prediction now. While the SOC has on average been under-predicted, it is because of a few outliers.

Wilkinson: Regarding the KMZ, the result of over-prediction has been that they front-loaded the season. There has been lots of dislocation in that area. I suggest we do something about that, and look at that.

Mohr: I plan to; I just didn't have time.

Boydston: I conclude from this analysis that regarding the exploitation rate inflation factors, that procedures we've used in recent years for adjusting for time and sub-area closures have also been appropriate.

Mohr: Yes.

Bingham: I appreciate your work. Thank you.

McCovey: I also thank you. We think you should expand the base period years.

Mohr: I don't know why they didn't use data before 1986. I know of no reason not to use it.

McInnis: What about subdivisions of the SOC?

Mohr: I don't know where that is at with the SSC and the STT. I think everyone is in agreement to limit Klamath impacts to north of Pt. Sur.

McIsaac: How much time would it take to do a KMZ sport analysis?

Mohr: Not much. It could show substantial bias. But that could be due to Central Valley (CV) overestimation, for example. The quota is based on both CV and Klamath abundance predictions. Based on an inaccurate presumed low abundance of CV fish, the quota could be met early on Klamath fish by catching unexpected numbers of CV fish.

McIsaac: Aren't FTB and CSB quota fisheries also?

Dixon: Not that I am aware of.

Boydston: You could look at just the past 2 years, when we were using a seasonal approach.

Fletcher: If we adjust the KMZ sport, and adopt these other recommendations, where is the safety factor?

Mohr: I believe the model should predict harvest rates as close as possible to observed harvest rates and then you can make policy buffers. Those two things should be separate.

Fletcher: I'm cautious, because this year we're managing for the floor.

McIsaac: We want to keep the science clean. Let's have public comment now.

Agendum 12. Pubic Comment.

Koblick: My name is Don Koblick from Princeton Harbor. I fished the Klamath from 1936 until 1943. There was logging back then, and net harvest, but still there were a lot of fish. Who knows why they've disappeared? I don't. I hope you can solve it. Commercial fishermen have been disappearing at 15% per year. When I got my limited entry permit, there were 5000 boats. Last year about 800 boats landed fish. We are the endangered species. We get 2/3 less for our fish, and our costs are higher. No new boats are being built. Eventually no more commercial fishing will be left. In the TV documentary called on the Cadillac Desert they described a choice the government made between water or fish, and the government decided on water. To this day, that's still what's going on.

MacLean: I'm Duncan MacLean, SAS troll representative. We have a proposal for an experimental fishery in Ft. Bragg. We may not push it this for this year, but we would like to see it modeled. This would be designed for the couple dozen local fishermen left in the area, keeping the larger boats out. John Geibel, CDFG, helped to put it to the SSC. Please address the importance of managing hatchery stocks. We keep eliminating natural production areas. We need to focus on hatcheries for their intended purpose: mitigation. I don't think we've been given adequate mitigation for lost habitat on either the Sacramento or Klamath basins.

McIsaac: Please give this to staff to make copies (Handout M).

Wilkinson: Be aware that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) will be re-licensing those facilities for 50-60 years, rather than 10-15. We need to get our mitigation numbers together to add to this re-licensing process.

MacLean: That is critical. I've heard of 200,000 to 400,000 fish runs in the Klamath system. We don't come anywhere close to that, even in prolific years.

Cribbs: Regarding habitat and water at the Commission meeting. Mr. McGeoghan is looking into providing adequate water for fisheries in their strategic planning. The Klamath River Basin Task Force folks proposed the same allocation as the last year's proposal. We also ask the KFMC to include provisions for weak stocks from the ocean,. That focused fishery last year over harvested winter run. Klamath fish taken in the ocean were less than predicted last year, but you have to look at other stocks.

McIsaac: You are speaking of what focused fishery?

McInnis: Last year, an experimental early-season fishery at the very southern end of the troll fishery range was designed to avoid Klamath impacts. It opened April 15 from Lopez Pt. to Pt. Magoo. It was limited to 10,000 chinook. We were expecting it to last until May, but it closed after 8 days. It was closely monitored by CDFG and genetic stock identification (GSI) samples were taken. Preliminary results showed the Klamath impacts were negligible, but winter run chinook showed up as 2% of the early samples. That would expand to be about 200 winter chinook taken. The whole winter chinook spawning run was only 500 fish. NMFS sent a letter to the PFMC saying they would oppose the continuation of this fishery.

Wilkinson: Are these weak stocks impacts limited to the Sacramento?

Cribbs: No. Butte Creek, Mill Creek, and Deer Creek stocks are candidates. There may be impacts there. What's going to be proposed for listing next? Someone should look at the genetics of Klamath fish, due to introduced eggs in the past.

Bingham: There was very poor survival of introduced stocks back then. The genetic analysis by Dr. Graham Gaul showed the isolation of Klamath fish from Central Valley stocks.

Cribbs: Still we should look at the data.

Boydston: Did the Commission not make a decision?

Cribbs: Yes they decided on a range of 15-20%. They didn't accomplish their goal of setting an allocation.

Boydston: Do they expect us to pick the number?

Cribbs: They want it modeled out and looked at by the PFMC.

Fletcher: We are doing a genetic study of stocks in the lower basin.

Bostwick: Mr. McInnis, what did you project the impacts of winter run would be in that experimental fishery?

McInnis: About 10 fish.

Bostwick: Last meeting you said ocean fisheries didn't harvest over the objectives, even though the fishery was so large, but in this case they over harvested. What were you trying to protect?

McInnis: We were trying to see what stocks were there. On Tuesday evening, Dr. Michael Banks and Dr.

Gary Weinans will be presenting information on this topic at 7:00.

Reinholdt: We would appreciate if that was made available to the SAS. How many tags were there?

McInnis: There were about 480 samples. After 100 tags were found, 2 of them were winter run. There was 70% sampling of tags.

Welter: I'm Jim Welter. We have gone for buffers in the KMZ. We want to see other fishers also supply the buffer. Why should it only be us? Also, about that experimental fishery: if you do an experiment and the experiment fails, you don't do it again.

Koblick: At the Santa Rosa Salmon Information meeting, I heard that 7000 winter run fish were sucked up by agricultural pumps in the Central Valley. Why not shut them off?

McInnis: There is work going on to reduce that through screen efforts and making sure there is positive flow downstream through the Delta.

Bingham: The habitat committee will hold a special meeting tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. on Central Valley issues.

McIsaac: Close public comment. Let's take a break

BREAK

McIsaac: We need to set our next meeting. The PFMC sets options on Tuesday and on Wednesday revises them. Tuesday is the most important day for us.

[Members discuss meeting times].

McIsaac: 8:00 a.m. Monday sounds good.

Agendum 13. Develop a range of options for the 1998 management season.

McIsaac: Let's look at our motions from the last meeting. We had a motion that passed that all fisheries be monitored. We had a motion that passed from Paul Kirk that one or more of the PFMC options give 17% of the non tribal allocation to the KMZ sport and that there be no 15% conservation buffer. Then we had a motion that was withdrawn to give 33% of the non-tribal share to inriver sport. Then we had a failed motion to model a fresh water seasonal approach.

Bostwick: Paul pulled the buffer part from his motion.

Kirk: No, I said one or more of the options should have 17% and no buffer on any.

Bitts: I agree.

McInnis: If members could preview their motions now, then we can think about them.

Wilkinson: My motion would be along the lines that the KFMC recommend that the PFMC adopt an option for public review giving 15% of non-tribal impacts to inriver, and a 50/50 California/Oregon split, and that they adopt one option giving 20% to inriver.

Boydston: I would like to see an option with no allocation north/south and a quota for the KMZ sport fishery. At the Salmon Informational meeting a member of the public requested a quota for the KMZ sport.

Fletcher: I may make a motion that one option give 12,000 fish to the tribal share, reflecting our emergency subsistence minimum need.

Bitts: I would make a motion that the KOHM be used with modifications following Michael Mohr's recommendations.

Wilkinson: We really need information from the TAT on the KMZ fisheries.

McIsaac: Let's see the magnitude of the bias.

Fletcher: I'd like to see a table of projected vs. observed harvest rates for the KMZ sport.

Kirk: It needs to be an in-depth analysis over the last 7 years. Over 7 years, the average has been 66% under fishing.

Bitts: They caught 1/3 of their Klamath allocation on the average for 7 years?

Kirk: Yes. We need clarification on Tuesday from Mr. McGeoghan on what CFGC intended by a range of 15-20%.

McInnis: I don't think you'll get it. Mr. McGeoghan probably won't be there. If Robert Treanor comes, he'll speak only to the motion.

Bostwick: I may make a motion for 20% for in river. But I will be back in the future for 33%.

Bitts: I would like to see the ocean share outside the KMZ be punted to the SAS.

McInnis: LB you mentioned no allocation north/south? What does that mean?

Boydston: That means that after the KMZ allocation is taken out, that we let the SAS determine the rest.

McInnis: If we pass nothing, is there a past recommendation that still stands?

McIsaac: I don't think so.

Bitts: Since our five year agreement expired, we've made one recommendation per year after that.

Kirk: Will the motions made at the last meeting go to the SAS or the PFMC?

McIsaac: They will go to both. Staff, please give us a transcript of these motions. We will now recess and reconvene tomorrow morning at 8:00 am.

RECESS

Monday, March 9th, 8:00 am

RECONVENE

Members present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Pliny McCovey	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Jennifer Silveira (for R. Iverson)	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conserv. Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish & Game
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fishery Management Council

Other speakers:

Michael Mohr	Technical Advisory Team
--------------	-------------------------

McIsaac: Let's continue our discussion from yesterday.

Boydston: I would like to make a request of staff for a large pad of paper or an overhead projector to allow us to write motions down for everyone.

Mohr: We finished our work-up of the KMZ sport. We have a report, but we need to have copies made by staff.

McIsaac: Let's take a five minute break.

BREAK

Added Agendum. Tat Report: Bias in The KMZ Sport Prediction.

Mohr: As you can see in our handout, (Handout N) the graphs are arranged as in Handout L, with seasonal results in the right-hand column. There is on average about a 40% over-prediction of harvest rate in the KMZ sport in years 1991-1997.

Boydston: How would you fix the model?

Mohr: In the same way as the Coos Bay cell; scale down what the model is currently predicting.

Boydston: Would you bring this up to the STT?

Mohr: Yes.

Bitts: If the modeling is left the same and the buffer is removed, what happens?

Mohr: Move the points on the graphs for 1996 and 1997 up 15%, and that would be what the harvest rate would have been for those years without a buffer.

McInnis: A predictor that is unbiased can be high or low, but it just varies in equal amounts. Are there any confidence intervals on these predictors?

Mohr: No. That is a different issue.

McCovey: An analysis based on two years data would give us heart burn.

Mohr: That's why I didn't do it yesterday.

McInnis: I wasn't discussing only the KMZ sport. I was referring to all cells.

Agendum 13 (cont.) Develop a range of options for the 1998 management season.

McIsaac: Can we combine some of the motions described yesterday?

Wilkinson: **I make a motion that the KFMC recommend that the PFMC adopt one option for public review that corresponds to a 15% share of non-tribal impacts to freshwater sport fisheries, and include the principle of 50/50 North/south ocean sharing and that one option correspond to a 20% share of non-tribal impacts to freshwater sport fisheries and it should hold Oregon fisheries harmless.**

Kirk: **Second.**

Bingham: Please clarify what you mean by "hold Oregon fisheries harmless".

Wilkinson: That Oregon be held harmless for the difference between the 15% and 20%.

McIsaac: So the number of Klamath impacts for Oregon north of the KMZ would be the same under both options?

Wilkinson: Yes.

Boydston: That would be hard to compute. Would that apply to the KMZ sport?

Wilkinson: That's for the TAT to work out. I'm talking about principles here. I don't want this to endanger the coalition.

McIsaac: In the past, 50/50 sharing applied to outside the KMZ.

Bitts: We need to have an option modeled that also spreads the reduction in the ocean share evenly out over the ocean. I propose a friendly amendment to include a 17% share of the ocean allocation to the KMZ sport.

McIsaac: I suggest that we look at a matrix on the overhead first and then make friendly amendments.

Wilkinson: We had a motion last meeting for 17 %.

Boydston: Let's use a matrix like that used by the PFMC, with 3 options from most restrictive to least restrictive.

McIsaac: Let's add 17%, and no buffer somewhere.

Boydston: I would like to see, under the most restrictive option, that 18% got to the KMZ sport, with a quota fishery.

McInnis: I don't think only three options will work. If we make this recommendation, we won't see creativity in the SAS. I suggest we split the middle option into two, with one option having 20% inriver, 17% with no buffer for KMZ-S and the SAS dividing the troll impacts; and the other option with 15% inriver, 17% KMZ sport with a buffer and SAS divides troll.

Fletcher: I would like to offer that a 12,000 fish emergency minimum subsistence level for the tribes be applied. In the solicitor's opinion, page 37 footnote 39, this is allowed for.

Wilkinson: This Council has never had consensus on this number of 12,000.

McIsaac: We want to offer something for discussion have these modeled, and show the public the effects of these options.

Bitts: I won't support the 12,000 for analysis.

McInnis: I would like to see it modeled so we have more information if it comes up in discussions.

Bostwick: 15% is not acceptable to us for more than a modeling exercise.

McIsaac: I can put in the language "for modeling exercise only".

Bingham: This recommendation defines the negotiating universe. Not everything will be acceptable to everyone, but it sets side boards.

Kirk: The Commission put us in this position, by not defining the inriver allocation.

McIsaac: OK, let's have a 5 minute caucus.

BREAK

McIsaac: I have consolidated our motion and friendly amendments.

Fishery

Option

	I	II	IIb	II
	(Most restrictive)			(Least restrictive)
River Sport	20%	20%	15%	15%
KMZ Sport	18% (with quota)	17% (no buffer)	17% (no buffer)	17% (no buffer)
Troll	Hold Oregon Fisheries Harmless	SAS to decide	SAS to decide	50/50
Tribal	12,000	50%	50%	50%

Fletcher: I want 12,000 in all the options or have it say somewhere that the tribes assert that 12,000 is their minimum emergency need. If we can't have that, we want to see the 12,000 be in the least restrictive option.

McInnis: To compare the numbers after modeling, the tribal share should be the same in all the options, so it doesn't mask the other changes.

Wilkinson: I don't want to see that blanket 12,000.

Boydston: **I make a motion for friendly amendments: the matrix shown plus the added language.**

Wilkinson: **I'm agreeable.**

McIsaac: Does the second concur?

Kirk: I'm not ready yet. A suggestion has been made to put the 12,000 under the least restrictive option. I want consensus on it.

Fletcher: My amendment put 12,000 across the board, but it didn't fly. I want a footnote that would read "the tribes assert the there is a minimum need of 12,000 adult fall chinook."

Bingham: I must leave, but before I go, I want to support this matrix, the 12,000 is a matter of principle; it's only 100 fish. This group must reach consensus on this. I personally support it, because it's a small number of fish. I commend the Council on this work.

Bitts: I won't support the 12,000 on there at all.

McInnis: I prefer to take it off, but will go with the group's wishes. I do think it is properly placed in the most restrictive column.

Fletcher: It's not acceptable to us to take it off.

McCovey: This is just modeling, but it's also a matter of principle. Our ceremonial needs come first, then subsistence. There will be no commercial fishery for us this year.

Boydston: **To formalize this friendly amendment, I propose a footnote using Troy's language, plus an addition: "The tribes assert they have a minimum emergency need for 12,000 adult fall chinook that should be considered in setting the PFMC's ocean escapement goal. The KFMC has not reached consensus on this."**

McIsaac: Can this footnote make you more comfortable Dave?

Bitts: No, I want 50% across the board.

McIsaac: Is this footnote acceptable to Keith?

Wilkinson: **I accept.**

McIsaac: Let's take a caucus.

BREAK

Bitts: If the 12,000 is in this motion, we won't vote yes on it, and we won't abstain.

Boydston: This is a legal issue, and we are not prepared to deal with this here. Can we put in the motion to ask for guidance from the NOAA counsel? Something like "legal direction is needed on this issue?"

McInnis: Everybody has something uncomfortable in this. The tribes have conceded, and we've come so far.

Bitts: We have no legal direction. I'm sure it will be sought, but I cannot support this. What about when there are only 12,000 fish to be caught. Do they all go to the tribes?

McIsaac: This isn't an endorsement of that.

Bitts: It will be construed as such.

McIsaac: It shouldn't be.

Bitts: My sense of the history of this process is that it will be.

Fletcher: (Reads from the Solicitor's Opinion) October 1993 "The historical evidence that I have examined is

not sufficient to infer that the United States, in creating the extended Hoopa Valley Reservation, contemplated that in times of scarcity, fishing by other user groups, wherever located, could be completely cut off until the Indian's total ceremonial, subsistence, and commercial needs are satisfied." "This is not to say, however, that in times of severe shortage, certain tribal ceremonial and subsistence needs may not take priority over the privileges of other user groups. Page 27, second paragraph, and footnote 39. What we are talking about is bare-bones need, not shutting down other fisheries for commercial purposes.

Wilkinson: If it is in there, why are we arguing here?

Fletcher: It's important that you are aware of this issue. We could do it without you, but we want to communicate.

Wilkinson: Why are we hanging this up on something we've already decided?

McCovey: The tribes set our own seasons, without DOI and BIA concurrence.

Boydston: We need to clarify to the PFMC that the Tribes have regulatory authority over their own fishery. We need DOI/DOC counsel guidance.

Bitts: Now I think the tribes are saying they aren't bound by the Solicitor's Opinion.

Fletcher: No, we are not saying that.

McCovey: I said when the Hoopa Valley tribe sets their season, we don't need BIA, or CDFG approval first. That's all.

Kirk: Maybe we need to split the tribal part off the motion. It is unprecedented to put these all together, and maybe it is beyond our ability to reach consensus.

Boydston: **I move that we table the motion until this afternoon, and the two principals meet to work it out.**

McCovey: **Second.**

Motion passes unanimously.

Boydston: I would like to offer to facilitate this discussion.

McIsaac: Let's recess until 2:00 PM.

RECESS

Monday, March 9th, 2:00 pm

RECONVENE

Members present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Pliny McCovey	Hoopla Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Jennifer Silveira (for R. Iverson)	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopla Indians residing in the Klamath Conserv. Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other speakers:

Duncan MacLean	SAS California Troll
----------------	----------------------

Boydston: Mr. Bitts, McCovey, and Fletcher met at 1:00 PM. I served as facilitator. I'm pleased to report we reached agreement on amendments for the matrix. Footnote 1 has some edits, and there will be a Footnote 2 (see matrix below).

McCovey: I commend LB

Bitts: I want to thank LB

Fletcher: I also want to thank Dave and LB

McIsaac: Let's bring back the motion with friendly amendments. Thank you LB.

Wilkinson: **I move to remove the original motion from the table.**

Kirk: **I second.**

Motion passes to remove from tabling, unanimously.

McIsaac: Staff, please put the matrix back up

FisheryOption

	I (Most restrictive)	II a	II b	III (Least restrictive)
River Sport	20%	20%	15%	15%
KMZ Sport	18% (with quota)	17% ¹ (no buffer)	17% ¹ (no buffer)	17% ¹ (no buffer)

Troll ⁽²⁾	Hold Oregon Fisheries Harmless	SAS to decide	SAS to decide	50/50 ³
Tribal	12,000 ⁵	50% ⁴	50% ⁴	50% ⁴

- 1/ Model as a seasonal management approach; buffer or no buffer refers to buffer approach used in 1996 and 1997.
- 2/ Marine fisheries outside the KMZ sport fishery.
- 3/ 50/50 sharing of age 4 Klamath impacts between California and Oregon fisheries outside the KMZ sport fishery.
- 4/ The Tribes assert they have a minimum emergency need for 1998 of 12K adult fall chinook which should be considered in setting the PPMC's ocean escapement goal. The KPMC has not reached consensus on this issue.
- 5/ For 1998, this option exceeds 50% for the Tribes. The KPMC has not reached agreement on this issue; there is disagreement over the legal requirements for harvest management at low stock sizes.

Boydston: Clarification: Is the 50/50 California/Oregon sharing for four year olds?

Wilkinson: Yes.

Bostwick: I want to clarify that this is for modeling purposes only.

Bitts: Definitely.

McIsaac: **(Restates the motion, as it appears above). Call for the question.**

Motion passes unanimously.

McIsaac: I commend the Council on passing this unprecedented range of motions. Are there any other suggestions for motions?

Fletcher: I want to express my concern regarding the KOHM and whether to use outliers in analysis. I recommend Option C in Michael Mohr's analysis.

Wilkinson: The forgotten element in this is the KMZ troll. The SAS should note that, and see what they can do for that fishery.

Bitts: Keith, do we want to say more regarding the SAS split of ocean fisheries, since SAS is here?

Wilkinson: Not now.

MacLean: Is the hold harmless for all ocean commercial fisheries?

Wilkinson: Just Oregon fisheries. Let the SAS decide about the KMZ in Oregon.

Bitts: In the option with 20% to inriver, the intent was to have SAS distribute the reduction across the ocean. In the restricted option, the reduction would come from California troll only.

Boydston: **I make a motion that the STT consider the recent assessment of the KOHM performance since 1991 done by Michael Mohr and Rich Dixon (including the KMZ sport fishery management) in analyzing ocean impacts for 1998. However, we urge the PFMC caution in adopting regulation options for 1998, because of low Klamath stock sizes.**

Fletcher: **I second.** Is that caution for the KMZ sport cell or for the whole model?

Boydston: The whole model.

McIsaac: Is the caution meant for the team or the PFMC?

Boydston: The PFMC.

Bitts: I have a sense of the motion, and that is to use the best tools available to estimate ocean impacts on Klamath stocks. I support it. There are many sources of caution. I'm concerned that with the sudden attack of caution we might lose all ocean fisheries. Some degree of buffering in ocean fisheries is okay but habitat doesn't get docked for buffering. If 88% of the fish are already escaping the ocean, do you really expect to get any more benefit out of increasing it to 92%?

McIsaac: Call for the question.

Motion passes; McCovey and Fletcher abstain.

McIsaac: Another issue is managing for the 35,000 spawner floor. The TAT report on the floor is not done. What is the risk to the floor this year? What is the Council's comfort level?

Bitts: We've had two technical reports from Drs. Cope and Praeger that both tentatively conclude that MSY is close to the 35,000 floor. It's wise to leave a buffer. The 1995 brood year which produced this year's apparently weak 3-year-old class, had a good population of parents and good water year, for whatever that's worth.

Fletcher: I'm glad we passed the last motion, but my concerns regarding the 35,000 spawner floor remain. We saw the exercise the TAT did regarding the Shasta CRMP concerns. I don't like how the CRMP went about it, but they did have some valid concerns. I reserve judgment on the 35,000 floor analysis until I understand how the floor compromises our sub-stocks management.

McInnis: The 35,000 is part of the regulations. It's very difficult to do anything different. We should continue with a methodical review of the floor.

McIsaac: We still must discuss funding, letters from agenda 4,5, & 6, and set the next meeting.

Wilkinson: I would like to schedule a Wednesday 12-1 meeting to address these and new items coming up.

Bitts: Can we rank the letters by urgency?

McInnis: The EA letter should be sent out ASAP.

McIsaac: How about Nat's letter regarding monitoring funding? (Handout O)

Boydston: I am not aware that we are reducing state funding of activities. It is the loss of federal reimbursements from the BOR and the Trinity River Restoration Project (TRRP). This letter would take re-crafting. It should go to the Secretary of Interior, or William Hogarth.

McInnis: Does Anadromous Fish Act (AFA) funding come to the State from USFWS in addition to NMFS?

Boydston: No, it only comes from NMFS, and it's in decline. When the Sportfish Restoration Act funds became more available, DOI took away AFA funds.

McIsaac: Let's schedule a meeting tomorrow from 12-12:30.

Boydston: Regarding the EA letter, we should support TF input on this issue instead.

Fletcher: The TF includes Klamath County, one of the main water users, and they vetoed a similar letter. This is our last chance to send a letter.

Wilkinson: Klamath water is under adjudication and many Oregon folks have been constrained to allow that adjudication to take place.

Boydston: I'm not prepared to make this statement that "all the alternatives under consideration are inadequate to provide instream flow needs."

Silveira: The motion that passed was to point out the mandates and the conflict that exists. We have a problem with the fourth paragraph. We would like to strike the first sentence, and in the second sentence, the text "reconsider the alternatives described in the EA, and ". So the sentence would read "We ask that you include.."

McIsaac: In the first paragraph, we should quote the EA exactly. Troy, perhaps you can make these edits.

Wilkinson: I would abstain from a vote on this.

McInnis: The BOR has been doing this on a year by year basis; I would like to see language encouraging a long range view.

McIsaac: Let's set meetings on Tuesday from 12-12:30 and on Wednesday from 12:00-1:00 PM.

Bitts: I hope we can address agenda 8 tomorrow. I commend the staff in the timeliness of their support today.

RECESS

Tuesday, March 10th, 12 pm

RECONVENE

Members Present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Jennifer Silveira (for R. Iverson)	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopla Indians residing in the Klamath Conserv. Area
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rod McInnis	National Marine Fisheries Service
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Other Speakers:

Rich Dixon	California Department of Fish and Game
------------	--

Agendum 17. Public Comment.

(None presented)

Agendum 5. Letter to the Secretary of Interior regarding the EA of Klamath River flows.

Fletcher: I submit the following edits (Handout P).

Silveira: I have distributed a transcript of the original motion (Handout Q).

Wilkinson: I'm comfortable with the edits, but will abstain due to the adjudication issue.

Silveira: That would be acceptable to our seat.

Fletcher: I didn't include the issue raised by Rod.

McInnis: That's okay.

Bitts: We can address the long term later. **I make a motion to adopt the letter as edited.**

Fletcher: **I second.**

Motion passes, Wilkinson and Silveira abstain.

Agendum 4. Letters to Cindy Barry and Dave Webb regarding the Shasta issue.

McIsaac: Our next item are the letters to Dave Webb and Cindy Barry; we have from staff the older drafts (Handouts R and S) and edited versions (Handouts B and C).

Bitts: I make a motion to adopt and send the letters as they appear here, and send them to Cynthia Barry and Dave Webb.

Fletcher: **Second.**

McIsaac: Call for the question.

Motion passes unanimously.

Agendum 8. Letter on hatchery marking.

McIsaac: Now we have the letter on hatchery marking; we were to think about the letters from 1997 regarding marking of coho and steelhead, as well as a recommendation associated with Dr. Hankin's presentation in Eureka.

Kautsky: I have a draft of a letter (Handout T) that will be distributed to you.

McIsaac: Let's take a look at this letter and address it at our next meeting. Our next meeting will be at noon tomorrow. We will expect to hear what the PPMC has asked the team to describe, and collate the three or four options. We can offer refinements to that. We will look at the hatchery letter, and we will make a final recommendation for funding from the TF.

Bitts: We also need to address mass marking of coho and steelhead at the hatchery.

Fletcher: I won't allow a letter to go out on that yet. I want this Council to review the issue before that.

McIsaac: Let's have that topic on Sunday, at our April meeting.

Added Agendum. Late fall run tag recoveries.

Dixon: I have a handout (Handout U) that presents the 1997 late fall run CWT recoveries after August 31st. These are ages 3, 4, and 5, expanded for sampling. Because they are expanded, some of these represent single tag recoveries. I don't know the origin of the tags (where they were recovered), but I can look them up.

Fletcher: The 1992 brood year was the last year that tags were applied to lower river stocks: Pecwan, Hunter, Blue Creek. I think the 1993 brood year was the last year that tags were applied to Horse Linto Creek fish. There is a data gap here. With help from the state, we could apply those tags, as we still do outmigrant monitoring.

McIsaac: We saw in Eureka that about 650 fall chinook were taken in the fall season. Do these 20 tags blow up to 650 fish?

Dixon: Yes. See the last page of the stock projection report, Table 4. We expanded it based on the inriver run size vs. the number of tags for that report, by age class.

Bitts: Last year there were enough presumptive age-5 tags recovered in the ocean that it seemed worthwhile to break them out and see whether they were actually age-5 or late-returning age-4 fish. The data are too thin this year to support that kind of break-out and expansion.

McIsaac: The ratio is 1-53. Let's recess until noon tomorrow.

Wednesday, March 11th, 12:00 pm

RECONVENE

Members present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon fishing Industry
Pliny McCovey	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Jennifer Silveira (for R. Iverson)	Department of the Interior
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Nat Bingham	Pacific Fishery Management Council

McIsaac: The PFMC is still in session. We have nothing from the STT to go over at this time Wilkinson: Let's recess for 15 or 20 minutes until the PFMC recesses. In the meantime we can discuss our April meeting.

McIsaac: Should we meet later this week?

Wilkinson: There are too many conflicts.

Kirk: I suggest we start the April meeting at 2:00 PM.

McIsaac: We'll meet at 2:00 PM. on Sunday, April 5th, in Portland at the Columbia DoubleTree.

Wilkinson: I would set a goal post for addressing funding at our next meeting. On the TF side we have our budget coming up, and once the budget prioritization is completed, last minute requests mess up the process.

McIsaac: Let's recess for 30 minutes.

Wednesday, March 11th, 1:00 PM

RECONVENE

Members present:

Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Jennifer Silveira (for R. Iverson)	Department of the Interior
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area

Don McIsaac
Virginia Bostwick
Nat Bingham
LB Boydston

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Pacific Fishery Management Council

Other speakers:

George Kautsky
Jim Welter

Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries Dept.
Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Recreational Fisher

McIsaac: We have a quorum present. Let's address the letter on hatcheries, and make TAT assignments.

Agendum 8. Letter on hatchery marking (continued).

McIsaac: This letter (Handout T) mentions estimating the numbers of fish released. Has that been done in the past? What is that used for?

Kautsky: The estimate of the number of fish released from the hatchery are used in the production multiplier. The Hoopa Valley Tribe uses it in their cohort reconstruction. Fletcher: Isn't it used to track success in meeting our 66% brood harvest rate?

Kautsky: Brood escapement rate is based on the cohort reconstruction.

McIsaac: What about sonar counts being used to avoid handling?

Kautsky: Dr. Hankin doesn't think it's accurate. In Dr. Hankin's and Dr. Zajanc's report, they propose a methodology that would give statistical confidence bounds. We don't know if that is feasible, but maybe the hatchery has some alternatives.

Fletcher: The number of fish released from the hatchery is used to determine ocean impacts. If there is a 20% margin of error associated with the production multiplier, that is significant.

McIsaac: This 20% error rate is not historic?

Kautsky: The Hankin study observation produced the 20% error estimate. Our understanding is that the hatchery spawns eggs, and we know the egg count. After incubation and hatching, the dead eggs are subtracted, and the fish are ponded. That is the last enumeration of the fish. Some dead fish are counted, but cannibalism is not known.

Boydston: This Council needs information from the hatcheries also. If this is an issue at Trinity hatchery, we need to focus on all of the hatcheries and rearing facilities in the basin, including the tribal facilities. I feel George should try to work this out with the Region.

Fletcher: At the trust evaluation meeting for how hatcheries are being run, this issue will be brought up. The letter does include Iron Gate Hatchery. We have seen both sides of this issue, that must be addressed soon if we are to take action this year. We didn't see any concrete technical objection from the hatchery. My impression is that it is an attitude that they don't want fish managers telling them what to do.

Boydston: Isn't that a legitimate concern? We need to go to the Region with this directly. I will abstain from a vote. We're not hearing the hatchery's side.

Fletcher: Can we request a meeting as soon as possible?

[McCovey arrives]

McCovey: How do we get more information?

Boydston: Scott Barrow can get us an explanation of the procedure for developing expansion factors.

Kautsky: We want to see the regional CDFG people there too on the 23rd of March.

McIsaac: If we are not following the procedure the TAT used to estimate the fall impacts, (and that is the number of tags in the Klamath versus all the other fish in the Klamath), if we're using hatchery production multipliers, then we have a grievous error in the data set. If we aren't using hatchery production multipliers, then this is still a good opportunity to make an improvement. Let's take LB's suggestion.

[Boydston leaves] [Bitts arrives]

Agendum 19. TAT assignments.

Fletcher: I would like to give the TAT an assignment: to review the overages inriver from the conservation perspective. I'm not comfortable with the KOHM analysis. Michael Mohr's analysis looked at specific cells' bias, but there are other biases.

Bostwick: For conservation purposes, no one asks what the Karuks are taking. It's only fair to look at that.

McIsaac: Troy, can you clarify?

Fletcher: We may adopt a recommendation from Mohr and Dixon on the KOHM. The focus of their analysis was issues of bias effecting management. I would like a closer look at the 35,000 spawner floor. Virginia brought up a fishery that she would like analyzed. It's the State of California's fault for allowing overages and not monitoring fisheries. I want to see the State guarantee that they'll monitor those fisheries including the I-5 fishery.

Bostwick: It's a question of the definition of monitoring. The State does monitor that upriver fishery by their definition. It may be budgetarily and physically impossible to do what you are asking.

Bitts: We did pass that motion that fisheries be monitored, and I think that would include the Karuk fishery which has only been monitored by them, I think with the exception of the 1993 season.

McCovey: Does Ms. Silveira know about funding through the FWS for counts of the Karuk fishery?

Silveira: Currently? No.

Kautsky: Or was there something funded by the TF?

Silveira: At this time I only know about a rearing project funded through the TF. I will check on it.

Kirk: A count was made of that fishery in one year, but that was not followed up by the State with a plan to manage it. There have been nine years out of 12 of over fishing inriver. We cannot allow over fishing. It is CDFG's responsibility.

Wilkinson: I would speak in behalf of Troy's assignment, to helpus formulate a request to the TF for unmet monitoring needs.

Fletcher: We know we have a different age structure now that we have 50/50 sharing. Coon Creek to the Bridge is where a gap is, and there are others.

McIsaac: Can the TAT show us the same data set as what we saw for the KMZ sport for various in river fisheries, as they are normally broken out by the State, by year. What is expected and what occurred, including for the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Karuk.

Bostwick: We need an explanation from the state on how they come up with the numbers on upriver sport harvest.

McIsaac: Let us put this on as an agendum in April. George, could you ask for a report in writing on how the catch estimates are made from the TAT?

Kautsky: It's hard to estimate the Karuk harvest. LB was supposed to visit them awhile back. We've been waiting two years for the result of that. From 1990-97, we have data for all fisheries. It depends on the availability of that data.

Wilkinson: I would like to see an action item in April on a budget request to the TF titled something like "Council monitoring needs/money".

McIsaac: Let's have public comment.

Agendum 17. Public comment.

Welter: I'm Jim Welter. What's the use of a good model if you don't put good numbers into it? Everyone wants to see correct numbers used in the model.

McIsaac: Further comments? Meeting adjourned.

ADJOURN

HANDOUTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Clarion Hotel, Millbrae, CA
March 8-11, 1998

Attachment #1

(Handouts are listed in the order they were introduced)

March 8, 1998

Agendum 3:	Handout A. Edits to minutes from October 1997 meeting.
Agendum 4:	Handout B. Revised draft letter to Cindy Barry regarding Shasta River.
Agendum 4:	Handout C. Revised draft letter to Dave Webb regarding Shasta River.
Informational:	Handout D. Letter from Jacqueline Schafer to Director, Fish and Game Commission.
Agendum 5:	Handout E. Draft letter to Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of Interior, regarding Klamath Project EA.
Agendum 7:	Handout F. Summary of California Steelhead plan.
Agendum 7:	Handout G. California Steelhead plan (CDFG).
Agendum 8:	Handout H. Draft letter to Robert Treanor regarding hatchery marking.
Agendum 9:	Handout I. KOHM run using 15% inriver allocation.
Agendum 9:	Handout J. KOHM run using 20% inriver allocation.
Agendum 10:	Handout K. Bias correction for the 1998 KOHM.
Agendum 10:	Handout L. KOHM predicted vs. observed harvest graphs.
Agendum 12:	Handout M. Letter from Duncan MacLean to John Geibel regarding proposed special Ft. Bragg fishery.
Added Agendum:	Handout N. KMZ sport predicted vs. observed harvest graphs.
Agendum:	Handout O. Draft letter to Jacqueline Schafer, CDFG, regarding funding monitoring.
Agendum 5:	Handout P. Revised draft letter to Bruce Babbitt regarding Klamath project EA.
Agendum 5:	Handout Q. Motions made at February, 1998 KFMC meeting.
Agendum 4:	Handout R. Original draft letter to Cindy Barry regarding Shasta River.
Agendum 4:	Handout S. Original draft letter to Dave Webb regarding Shasta River.
Agendum 8:	Handout T. Draft letter to Tim Farley, CDFG, on hatchery marking, dated March 10, 1998.
Added Agendum:	Handout U. Late fall run chinook CWT recoveries for age 3, 4, & 5 fall chinook.

PARTICIPANTS
KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
Clarion Hotel, Millbrae, CA
March 8-11, 1998

Attachment #2

Members:

Keith Wilkinson:	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Ron McInnis:	National Marine Fisheries Service
Pliny McCovey, Sr.:	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Paul Kirk:	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Ron Iverson:	Department of the Interior
Don McIsaac:	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Troy Fletcher:	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
L.B. Boydston:	California Department of Fish and Game
Virginia Bostwick:	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
Dave Bitts:	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Nat Bingham:	Pacific Fisheries Management Council

Other Speakers:

Jerry Barnes:	Technical Advisory Team
Jennifer Silveira:	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Orcutt:	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Dave Hillemeier:	Technical Advisory Team, Yurok Fisheries
George Kautsky:	Technical Advisory Team, Hoopa Fisheries
Duncan MacLean:	SAS California Troll
Hal Cribbs:	Klamath River Basin Task Force
Jim Welter:	SAS, Port of Brookings
Carol Davis:	Klamath coalition
Don Koblick:	Half Moon Bay, FMA
Jim Andersen:	Half Moon Bay, FMA
Don Stevens:	Pacific Fishery Management Council, SAS Oregon Troll
Gerald Reinholdt:	PFMC, SAS, Oregon